Historic, Archive Document

Do not assume content reflects current
scientific knowledge, policies, or practices.

NUTRITION COMMITTEE NEWS

For exchange of information on nutrition education and school lunch activities.

AUGUST - SEPTEMBER WASHINGTON, D. C.

1.982
A2N955
Cop 5

SEP 5 - 1952

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

RAISING OUR SIGHTS FOR SCHOOL LUNCH

PRESENT STATUS

The number of children participating in the National School Lunch Program has more than doubled in the past 7 years—from less than 4 million in 1944 to more than 9 million in 1951-52. This is 30 percent of last year's school enrollment. This encouraging news comes from "The National School Lunch Program—A Progress Report," issued by the U. S. Department of Agriculture's Production and Marketing Administration (PMA). (See Materials.)

It also shows how much remains to be done. The Federal appropriation for the current year is about 83 1/3 million dollars, the same amount as last year. If more children are to participate, local support will have to be increased.

The growth of the program so far reflects its widespread support by children, parents, and communities . . . the high degree of cooperation among Federal, State, and local agencies . . . and the fine sense of responsibility that administrators and workers have shown in carrying it out.

Paralleling the growth in number of children participating is the increased emphasis on improving the nutritional quality and appetite appeal of meals served and utilizing the educational and social values of the program. Two out of three lunches in program schools last year were type A, whereas in 1944 less than half of school meals served reached that standard. Participating schools last year used 359 million quarts of milk plus 248 million pounds of other dairy products and over 570 million pounds of fruits and vegetables. These are protective foods often low in children's diets.

AN EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY

The Office of Education, with responsibility for the integration of the whole school program, again makes the point that school meals contribute to the educational and social as well as nutritional development of the child. Through a lunch program, children may get some understanding of (1) the characteristics of an adequate diet; (2) importance of a pleasant atmosphere to appetite and digestion; (3) good manners and consideration for others; (4) sanitary handling of food; (5) satisfaction of working with others in carrying forward a successful project; (6) relation between waste of food and waste of human labor; and (7) significance of food in world affairs.

To accomplish these educational purposes requires the cooperation of all. Some schools have worked through committees on which administrators, teachers, pupils, parents, and lunchroom staff were represented. They have reported that such representation has stimulated wider concern for the success of the undertaking and that the varied points of view have made for a better program.

Schools alert to the educational opportunities the school lunch offers find many ways to make it a part of school life. Some activities carried on successfully by elementary and high school pupils are . . . developing menus . . . preparing posters . . . giving skits or talks at assembly programs . . . holding discussions on school lunch problems in home rooms . . . writing about school lunch for newspapers . . . telling the community over the radio about the school lunch program.

High school pupils in addition have assisted with ordering and buying food . . . planning safe, convenient storage for food and lunchroom supplies . . . planning simple lay-outs for equipment and supplies to facilitate serving of food and clearing of tables . . . making market orders . . . checking food waste . . . keeping financial records. Teachers of art, business, English, home economics, mathematics, science, and "shop" have all found that the school lunch program presents many projects of lively interest to their pupils.

Schools have tried many other ways to involve all pupils in the educational aspects of school lunches. In the University High School, Columbus, Ohio, the lunchroom supervisor worked with each grade individually. She talked to the children in their home rooms about foods and combinations they liked. She discussed costs, foods in season, nutritive values, time required for meal

preparation, and other practical problems. The children planned menus with her help and guidance. Through such cooperative planning food prejudices were reduced, the children finding it easy to accept foods which they had written into menus.

In the same school a committee of pupils worked with the teachers in planning the redecoration and general improvement of the lunchroom. The committee got suggestions from the students in each home room as to how noise might be reduced, service speeded up, and general appearance and atmosphere of the lunchroom improved. They also obtained suggestions on ways students could improve table manners and behavior in the lunch line.

Ideas for posters illustrating various facts about foods, social practices, cleanliness, and interdependence among people and countries for food were suggested by a school-wide committee in a Denton, Texas, school. Committee ideas were carried out by the pupils in their home rooms. Posters were made on large sheets of wrapping paper, hung in a prominent place in the lunchroom, and changed regularly.

In the same city, an elementary teacher used the school garden to make a unit on nutrition more vital. The children measured the space, selected and planted the seed, and tended the plants. As the spinach, onions, radishes, and lettuce grew, the children were easily interested in learning about the value of these vegetables in the diet. When the vegetables were ready to eat, the children and the lunchroom supervisor planned a meal containing a salad made from the vegetables. Then the vegetables were gathered, made into salad, and served in the lunchroom.

These samples suggest only a few possibilities. The educational activities selected for a particular school will depend on the size of the school, the age of pupils, the available facilities, the organization of the school and the school lunch program, and the ingenuity of teachers and lunchroom workers. Above all, the imagination and vision of those responsible for directing the program will determine its outcome.

News About ICNESL

The annual report of the Interagency Committee on Nutrition Education and School Lunch (ICNESL) shows it

• • Developed a statement on goals for school lunch programs (copy enclosed).

• • Compiled a directory of contact people in ICNESL agencies who work with trainees and visitors from other countries, and brief statements of each agency's responsibilities in food and nutrition. Members of the committee will use these in describing nutrition programs of federal agencies and in helping to shape itineraries for foreign visitors coming to Washington.

• • Wrote a chapter on practical nutrition programs in this country for the 1951 Annual Report of the USA to the Food and Agriculture Organization of the UN at the request of the US-FAO Committee. The chapter includes discussion of measures to improve the nutrition of sections of the population in special need, to spread nutritional knowledge through school and community education programs, and to reduce losses of foods and waste of nutrients.

Other subjects discussed at monthly meetings of the ICNESL during the year have been: Developments in civil defense; the food situation; nutrition education, including methods (Feb. NCN), materials, and devices; and problems in meeting misinformation (Mar. NCN). Members also exchange news of agency programs and materials issued by their offices.

Miss Helen Stacey of the Children's Bureau was elected chairman and Miss Oneta Liter of the Rural Electrification Agency vice chairman of ICNESL for 1952-53.

PLANNING RESEARCH TO MEET NEEDS OF SCHOOLS

State school lunch supervisors are cooperating with the Federal Government in determining where practical research is needed. In the fall of 1951, PMA set up an advisory committee of State school lunch supervisors in each of the five PMA areas in the United States. These committees were requested to obtain recommendations regarding needed research from each of their State supervisors. Summaries of the recommendations were presented to PMA by the five chairmen at a conference in Washington in March 1952.

As a result of this meeting, four major categories of research were recommended by the group for immediate consideration:

1. Space and equipment needs for efficient operation of school lunch programs.

2. Factors which influence children's participation in the lunch program such as distance between home and school, nearness of other eating places, and price, quality and quantity of the school meal.

3. Ways to inform the public of the values of school lunch programs.

4. Characteristics of participating schools.

Reports of the Washington conference and plans for carrying on this research were given at the PMA Area meetings this summer.

Chairmen of State Nutrition Committees

Some of the 1952 changes

Georgia. Miss Catherine L. Newton, University of Georgia, Athens

Indiana. Miss Una Robinson, Indiana University, Bloomington

Michigan. Mrs. Bert Wermuth, Holly, Mich.

New Jersey. Mrs. Lorraine O. Gates, New Jersey Experiment Station, New Brunswick

New York State. Miss Dorothy Williams, Department of Health, New York City

REVIEW OF NUTRITIONAL REQUIREMENTS FOR SCHOOL LUNCHES

PMA has asked the Bureau of Human Nutrition and Home Economics (BHNHE) to review nutritional requirements used in the National School Lunch Program in the light of current research findings. Some preliminary recommendations for changes have been developed and discussed at the Area conferences this summer. A consultant committee, composed of State school lunch supervisors, was appointed at these meetings to consult with PMA and BHNHE on all phases of this project.

This coming school year extensive field tests of a tentative pattern will be made in cooperation with State agencies. The practicability of administration and the acceptability and nutritive value of lunches planned in line with recommendations will be checked.

If revisions are found desirable on completion of the work, changes in nutritional requirements which are to become effective July 1, 1953, will be announced no later than early May 1953. If testing of recommendations cannot be completed in time, the effective date will be July 1, 1954. Local managers and cooks will be acquainted with any such changes in summer workshops.

RECIPES ARE PRETESTED

School lunch recipes developed by BHNHE in cooperation with PMA are now being tested in schools in various sections of the country. In the past, recipes have been tested only in elementary and high schools in the vicinity of Washington, D. C. Testing of laboratory recipes in school kitchens helps determine: (1) the clearness of the recipe directions, (2) the practicality of procedures under usual school lunch operating conditions, and (3) the acceptability of the food prepared from the recipe when it is eaten by children as part of a regular school lunch.

State participation in this project is on a voluntary basis. The tests are conducted through the five PMA area offices. School lunch managers in cooperating schools choose the recipes they will test. The cooks then use the recipes to prepare dishes and serve them as part of the regular lunch. A State, district, county, or city school lunch supervisor, or one of the PMA Area home economists records her observations of procedures used in preparation of the recipes and the acceptance of the prepared dishes by the children.

Results of the recipe testing are compiled and evaluated by BHNHE. The published recipes include any revisions indicated.

SCHOOL LUNCH SANITATION CONFERENCE

Good sanitary practices are as essential in the school lunchroom as in other eating places. In most States and cities, health officials cooperate closely with school administrators in planning lunchroom operations to meet health standards. However, school sanitation practices are not uniform. To explore the subject and make recommendations a Conference was called in March 1952 in Roanoke, Va., by the magazine Modern Sanitation with the support of the Paper Cup and Container Institute. Twenty-two representatives of school, health, and school food service administrations, sanitary engineers, and nutritionists were invited. Each delegate was asked to bring material and questions on sanitation which might be helpful. Questions submitted were classified into three categories—administration, facilities, and personnel—and assigned to three committees for consideration. A report of the meeting with questions and answers is given in Modern Sanitation for May 1952.

The conference recommended that a small executive committee be chosen to plan subsequent action . . . that various methods of school lunch sanitation be studied . . . and that the group convene again within a year to discuss the results of the study and decide what follow-up may be needed.

ARKANSAS MAKES THE MOST OF ANNIVERSARIES

Marking birthdays and anniversaries is a universal practice which Arkansas schools have used to build support for school lunches. For example, the Clover Bend School celebration of the lunchroom's birthday focused attention of the entire school on the lunch program. Everyone had a piece of a huge birthday cake. The children brought gifts of small furnishings for the lunchroom.

At the opening of the new cafeteria in the Walnut Ridge School business men from the Chamber of Commerce, long-time contributors to the school program, were served lunch and entertained with a program of music.

In the McRae School the lunchroom anniversary was marked by a community party at which type A lunch was served. Two hundred school patrons and members of the PTA contributed gifts. In short talks, the superintendent, county health nurse, sanitarian, and district school lunch supervisor added to the community knowledge about the school lunch program.

MATERIALS

Listing of these materials is for information of readers and does not necessarily mean recommendation.

The publications listed below may be obtained from the addresses given after the name of the publication. The symbols refer to—

GPO—Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C.

N. J.—New Jersey Department of Education, 175 W. State St., Trenton 8, N. J.

MICH.—Michigan Department of Health, Old Dewitt Road, Lansing 4, Mich.

IND.—Indiana Council for Children and Youth, 1330 W. Michigan St., Indianapolis 7, Ind.

PMA—Office of Information Services, Production and Marketing Administration, USDA, Washington 25, D. C.

School Lunch Publications

THE NATIONAL SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAM—A PROGRESS REPORT. Food Distribution Branch, PMA. PA-208, 19 pp., illus. 1952. PMA.

GOALS FOR NUTRITION EDUCATION FOR ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS. Harvard School of Public Health. 1947. From The Nutrition Foundation, Inc. 405 Lexington Ave., New York 17, N. Y. 15¢

MAKING SCHOOL LUNCHES EDUCATIONAL. Office of Education, FSA. Nutrition Education Series, Pamphlet 2, 28 pp. 1944. GPO, 20¢

A NUTRITIONAL PROGRAM FOR SCHOOLS. A report of the Joint Committee on Health Problems in Education of the National Education Association and the American Medical Association. 9 pp. 1947. From American Medical Association, 535 N. Dearborn St., Chicago 10, Ill. 10¢

NUTRITION EDUCATION IN THE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL. Office of Education, FSA, in cooperation with USDA. 35 pp., illus. 1943. GPO, 25¢

SCHOOL LUNCH AND NUTRITION EDUCATION. Office of Education, FSA. Bul. 14. 12 pp. 1951. GPO, 10¢

A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY OF CATALOGS LISTING TEACHING AIDS FOR NUTRITION EDUCATION. H. S. Lockhart. Harvard School of Public Health. 5 pp., Mimeo. (1952.) From The Nutrition Foundation, Inc., Chrysler Bldg., New York 17, N. Y.

PLANNING AND PACKING A GOOD LUNCH. G-15. Folder. Rev. 1951. MICH. Single copies free.

LUNCHROOM COURTESIES IN THE ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS OF NEW JERSEY. Bul. 1. N. J. 25¢

SANITARY PRACTICES IN SCHOOL LUNCHROOMS OF NEW JERSEY. Bul. 2. N. J. 25¢

PREVENTING ACCIDENTS IN THE SCHOOL KITCHENS OF NEW JERSEY. Bul. 3. N. J. 25¢

A GUIDE FOR PLANNING SCHOOL LUNCHROOMS IN NEW JERSEY. Bul. 4. From Miss Elizabeth A. McHugh, Ivy Street School, Newark 6, N. J. $1.00. Make check payable to New Jersey Dietetic Association.

Foods and Nutrition — General

CANNING IN GLASS JARS IN SCHOOL AND INSTITUTIONAL KITCHENS. FRUITS AND OTHER ACID FOODS. B. F. Olsen. PMA. Agr. Handbook 11, 28 pp., illus. 1951. PMA.

COMMUNITY CANNING CENTERS. PMA. Misc. Pub. 544. 86 pp., illus. 1946. PMA.

FACT SHEET ON NEW BREAD STANDARDS. 5 pp. Mimeo. 1952. From Editorial Branch, Food and Drug Administration, FSA, Washington 25, D. C.

THE CALCIUM CONTENT OF COMMERCIAL WHITE BREAD. V. R. Goddard and M. W. Marshall. BHNHE. Tech. Bul. 1055. 27 pp., illus. 1952. GPO, 10¢

FOOD AND NUTRITION FACTS FOR HEALTH AND SOCIAL WORKERS. Michigan Home Economics and Dietetic Associations in cooperation with Michigan Department of Health and social workers from State and county social welfare agencies, and approved by Michigan State Medical Society. 32 pp., illus. 1949. MICH. Single copies free.

YOUR FOOD AND YOUR FIGURE. G-8. Folder. Rev. 1951. MICH. Single copies free.

CHECK UP ON YOUR MEALS. G-9. Folder. Rev. 1951. MICH. Single copies free.

MILK—DO YOU HAVE ENOUGH? G-21. Folder. MICH. Single copies free.

Other Materials

RAISING LABORATORY MICE AND RATS. O. Eaton and C. A. Cabell. Bur. Animal Industry, USDA. L-253. 10 pp., illus. 1949. GPO, 10¢

LEADERS GUIDE FOR UN DAY 1952. (kit of materials) From National Citizens Committee for United Nations Day, 816 21st St., N. W. Washington 6, D. C.

DISCUSSION BEGINS WITH PEOPLE. Indiana Council for Children and Youth. 15 pp., illus. Mimeo. IND. Free.

COMMITTEE WISE. Indiana Council for Children and Youth. 19 pp., illus. Mimeo. IND. Free.

Prepared by Bureau of Human Nutrition and Home Economics, U. S. Department of Agriculture, in consultation with the Interagency Committee on Nutrition Education and School Lunch. (The printing of this publication has been approved by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, July 10, 1952.)